

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
OXFORD DIVISION**

**MORGAN BUCKLEY**

**PLAINTIFF**

**v.**

**No. 3:24-CV-199-MPM-RP**

**DESOTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, et al.**

**DEFENDANTS**

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On July 10, 2024, Plaintiff Morgan Buckley initiated this lawsuit against the defendants Desoto County Sheriff's Department, City of Hernando, Keith Canizaro, Hunter Clayton, and several unidentified individuals. ECF #1. Subsequently, counsel for Buckley moved to withdraw as attorney of record, and in granting counsel's motion, United States Magistrate Judge Roy Percy allowed the plaintiff until November 22, 2024, to either retain counsel, to notify the court of her intention of proceed *pro se*, or to notify the court that she does not intend to prosecute the case further. Because Plaintiff failed to respond to said Order, Magistrate Judge Percy then entered a Show Cause Order [ECF #7], which provided in pertinent part:

[T]he plaintiff is hereby ORDERED to show cause, no later than December 17, 2024, as to why her complaint should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the court's Order or otherwise prosecute this action. If the plaintiff fails to respond and show cause as required by this order, this matter will be dismissed by the court.

Following Buckley's failure to respond to that order, Magistrate Judge Percy issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") recommending the dismissal of this case due to Buckley's failure to comply with the court's order and prosecute the case. ECF #9. The R&R warned Buckley that failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation by January 21, 2025, would bar appellate review of the decision except on plain error grounds. *Id.* No objections to the R&R have been filed and the time to file objections has now passed.

“With respect to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections were raised, the Court need only satisfy itself that there is no plain error on the face of the record.” Gauthier v. Union Pac. R.R. Co., 644 F. Supp. 2d 824, 828 (E.D. Tex. 2009) (citing Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428–29 (5th Cir. 1996)).

Having reviewed the R&R for plain error, the court concludes that it is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. According, the R&R [ECF #9] is **ADOPTED**. Plaintiff’s Complaint [ECF #1] is hereby **DISMISSED** with prejudice. The case is **CLOSED**.

**SO ORDERED** this the 19<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2025.

/s/Michael P. Mills  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI